

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Status of Claims

Claims 1-32 are currently pending in the application.

II. Election with Traverse

The Examiner has imposed a Restriction Requirement requiring an election between:

Group I, claims 1-19;

Group II, claims 20-27;

Group III, claims 28-31; and

Group IV, claim 32.

Applicants respectfully submit that it would not be a serious burden on the Examiner to search and examine all of the claims. Under MPEP § 803, "[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions". In the Applicants view, there exists enough common and related subject matter in the claims such that it would not be an undue burden for the Examiner to examine all of the claims.

Accordingly, the Applicants believe that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn in view of the related subject matter in the claims and that examination of the application would not be a burden.

Should the Examiner disagree with the above arguments, Applicants provisionally elect Group I, claims 1-19, for further prosecution in this application.

Response filed January 30, 2008
Responding to Office Action mailed October 30, 2007
App. Ser. No. 10/695,390

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Paul H. Nguyen-Ba
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 60,742

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: January 30, 2008